



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*The Vedic Dual: Part II, The Dual in Similes.*—By  
Dr. SAMUEL GRANT OLIPHANT, Professor in Grove  
City College, Grove City, Pennsylvania.

In the first part<sup>1</sup> of this study of the Vedic dual, the writer showed that when in either the Rig or the Atharva Veda a plurality of bodily parts that are naturally dual is ascribed to an individual, the grammatical number is due to the requirements of the mythic symbolism or of the metaphor or other poetic figure. This second part of the study will corroborate the conclusions there reached by presenting lists of all the Vedic duals occurring in similes and a study of the phenomena associated with them. Naturally the same principles are found operative in the simile as in the metaphor. These seem so fundamental and obvious that it would seem supererogatory to state them; but they have been sometimes so disregarded in the translation and interpretation of Vedic passages that there may be warrant for noting their value in exegesis.

The general principle is that when the stress of comparison falls upon the substantive terms of a simile, these terms are in numerical concord. Thus in the RV. we find the following duals after dual antecedents:—

After *açvínā*—*āñcā*, X, 106, 9<sup>d</sup>; \**akṣī*, II, 39, 5<sup>b</sup>; *ajā*, II, 39, 2<sup>a</sup>;  
\**adhvagāū*, VIII, 35, 8<sup>b</sup>; *apāsā*, X, 106, 1<sup>b</sup>; *āraṅgarā*, X,  
106, 10<sup>a</sup>; *īryā*, X, 106, 4<sup>c</sup>; \**udanyajā*, X, 106, 6<sup>c</sup>; \*\**upadhī*,  
II, 39, 4<sup>b</sup>; \**uṣṭārā*, X, 106, 2<sup>a</sup>; †*rbhū*, X, 106, 7<sup>c</sup>; \**ósthāu*, II,  
39, 6<sup>a</sup>; *kárnā*, X, 106, 9<sup>c</sup>; *kárnāu*, II, 39, 6<sup>d</sup>; *kiránā*, X,  
106, 4<sup>c</sup>; \**kinārā*, X, 106, 10<sup>c</sup>; \**kṣāmā*, II, 39, 7<sup>b</sup>; X, 106, 10<sup>d</sup>;

---

<sup>1</sup> See this *Journal*, XXX, p. 174 ff.

Starred words are ἀπαξ εἰρημένα in RV. Words marked with the obelisk are discussed later; those with the double obelisk have the comparative particle *nā*, all others have *iva* or *'va*.

*khīgalā*, II, 39, 4<sup>b</sup>; *gr̥dhrā*, II, 39, 1<sup>b</sup>; *gāūrā*, VII, 69, 6<sup>a</sup>; *gāūrāu*, V, 78, 2<sup>b</sup>; VIII, 87, 1<sup>d</sup>, 4<sup>d</sup>; *grāvānā*, II, 39, 1<sup>a</sup>; *gharmā*, X, 106, 8<sup>a</sup>; *cakravākā*, II, 39, 3<sup>c</sup>; <sup>1</sup>*jaranā*, X, 40, 3<sup>a</sup>; *jāratos*, VIII, 73, 11<sup>b</sup>; <sup>\*</sup>*jarbhārī*, X, 106, 6<sup>a</sup>; <sup>+</sup>*dāmpatī*, II, 39, 2<sup>d</sup>; *duṭā*, II, 39, 1<sup>d</sup>; X, 106, 2<sup>c</sup>; *nadyā*, II, 39, 5<sup>a</sup>; <sup>+</sup>*nābhye*, II, 39, 4<sup>b</sup>; <sup>\*\*</sup>*nāse*, II, 39, 6<sup>c</sup>; <sup>\*</sup>*nāitogā*, X, 106, 6<sup>b</sup>; *nāvā*, II, 39, 4<sup>a</sup>; <sup>+</sup>*nṛpātī*, X, 106, 4<sup>b</sup>; *pakṣā*, X, 106, 3<sup>a</sup>; *pajrā*, X, 106, 7<sup>a</sup>; *patarā*, X, 106, 8<sup>c</sup>; *pādā*, II, 39, 5<sup>b</sup>; X, 106, 9<sup>b</sup>; *pārijmānā*, X, 106, 3<sup>d</sup>; *paṇvā*, X, 106, 3<sup>b</sup>; *pitārā*, III, 58, 2<sup>b</sup>; <sup>+</sup>VII, 67, 1<sup>d</sup>; X, 39, 6<sup>b</sup>; 106, 4<sup>a</sup>; *pitārāu*, X, 131, 5<sup>a</sup>; *putrā*, X, 106, 4<sup>a</sup>; <sup>+</sup>*pradhī*, II, 39, 4<sup>b</sup>; <sup>\*</sup>*pravāsā*, VIII, 29, 8<sup>b</sup>; *prāyogā*, X, 106, 2<sup>b</sup>; *brhāntā*, X, 106, 9<sup>a</sup>; *brahmānā*, II, 39, 1<sup>c</sup>; <sup>+</sup>*mananyā*, X, 106, 8<sup>d</sup>; *mahiṣā*, VIII, 35, 7<sup>b</sup>-9<sup>b</sup>; X, 106, 2<sup>d</sup>; *mitrā*, X, 106, 5<sup>b</sup>; *mṛgā*, X, 40, 4<sup>a</sup>; *méne*, II, 39, 2<sup>c</sup>; *mésā*, X, 106, 5<sup>d</sup>; <sup>+</sup>*yugé*, II, 39, 4<sup>a</sup>; *yuvaçā*, VIII, 35, 5<sup>a</sup>; *rathyā*, II, 39, 3<sup>d</sup>; <sup>\*</sup>*rājaputrā*, X, 40, 3<sup>d</sup>; *vānsagā*, X, 106, 5<sup>a</sup>; *vājā*, X, 106, 5<sup>c</sup>; *vātā*, II, 39, 5<sup>a</sup>; *vīrā*, II, 39, 2<sup>a</sup>; *çaphāu*, II, 39, 3<sup>b</sup>; <sup>+</sup>*çñge*, II, 39, 3<sup>a</sup>; *çyenā*, V, 74, 9<sup>d</sup>; VIII, 73, 4<sup>b</sup>; *çyenāu*, VIII, 35, 9<sup>a</sup>; *çrustivānā*, X, 106, 4<sup>d</sup>; *çvānā*, II, 39, 4<sup>c</sup>; *sāraghā*, X, 106, 10<sup>b</sup>; *sudīnā*, X, 106, 1<sup>d</sup>; *stānāu*, II, 39, 6<sup>b</sup>; *harisāu*, V, 78, 1<sup>c</sup>-3<sup>c</sup>; VIII, 35, 8<sup>a</sup>; *harināu*, V, 78, 2<sup>a</sup>; *hástā*, II, 39, 7<sup>a</sup>; *hástāu*, II, 39, 5<sup>c</sup>; *hāridravā*, VIII, 35, 7<sup>a</sup>. (92)

After *ródasī*,— *adhvarā*, III, 6, 10<sup>c</sup>; <sup>+</sup>*nārī*, X, 93, 1<sup>b</sup>; *mātārā*, IX, 18, 5<sup>b</sup>.

After *hārī* (*īndrasya*),— *pakṣā*, VIII, 34, 9<sup>b</sup>; <sup>+</sup>*rājī*, X, 105, 2<sup>c</sup>.

After *babhrū* (*īndrasya*),— <sup>+</sup>*kanīnaké*, IV, 32, 23<sup>a</sup>.

After *dhiṣāṇe*,— <sup>+</sup>*cārmanī*, VI, 8, 3<sup>c</sup>.

After *adhiṣavanyā*,— *jaghānā*, I, 28, 2<sup>a</sup>.

After *bāhū* (*agnimanthanāu*),— *tāskarā*, X, 4, 6<sup>a</sup>.

After (*havirdhāne*),— *yamé*, X, 13, 2<sup>a</sup>.

After *ādrī*,— *rathyā*, VII, 39, 1<sup>c</sup>.

After *çipre* (*īndrasya*),— <sup>\*</sup>*srūvā*, X, 96, 9<sup>a</sup>. (12)

So with elliptic duals:

After <sup>2</sup>*kṣonī*,— <sup>+</sup>*mātārā*, VIII, 99, 6<sup>b</sup>.

After *pitārā* (*ṛbhūṇām*),— *yūpā*, IV, 33, 3<sup>b</sup>.

After <sup>3</sup>*āyaji* (*āulūkhalāu*),— *hārī*, I, 28, 7<sup>c</sup>. (3)

<sup>1</sup> So Sāyaṇa, Grassmann *RV.* and *WB.* but Ludwig *RV.* takes it as inst. sg.

<sup>2</sup> See *JAOS* XXXII, 42.

<sup>3</sup> See *JAOS* XXXII, 43.

Also with dual dvandvas:

After *uṣāsānāktā*,— <sup>+</sup>*dhenū*, VII, 2, 6<sup>b</sup>; <sup>+</sup>*pātnī*, I, 122, 2<sup>a</sup>;  
*padé*, III, 55, 15<sup>a</sup>; <sup>+</sup>*vayyè*, II, 3, 6<sup>b</sup>.

After *mitrāvārunā*,— <sup>†</sup>*acvā*, VI, 67, 4<sup>a</sup>; *pitārā*, IV, 41, 7<sup>d</sup>;  
<sup>†</sup>*rathyā*, VI II, 25, 2<sup>a</sup>; *vrajā*, V, 64, 1<sup>c</sup>.

After *indrāgnī*,— *āñcā*, V, 86, 5<sup>d</sup>; *ācvā*, VI, 59, 3<sup>b</sup>.

After *indrāsómā*,— *ācvā*, VII, 104, 6<sup>b</sup>; <sup>+</sup>*nrpātī*, VII, 104, 6<sup>d</sup>.

After *indrābrahmanaspatī*,— (*ācvā*) *yūjā*, II, 24, 12<sup>d</sup>.

After *indrāvāyā*,— <sup>†</sup>*duṭā*, VII, 91, 2<sup>a</sup>.

After *dyāvāprthivī*,— <sup>†</sup>*mene*, I, 95, 6<sup>a</sup>.

After *indrāvārunā*,— *vṛsabhā*, IV, 41, 5<sup>b</sup>. (16)

Two singulars may be substituted for the antecedent dual:

After *vīpātī chutudrī*,— *ācve*, III, 33, 1<sup>b</sup>; *gāvā (mātārā)* III,  
33, 1<sup>c</sup>; *mātārā (gāvā)*, III, 33, 3<sup>c</sup>; *rathyā*, III, 33, 2<sup>b</sup>.

After *yamā yamī ca*,— <sup>+</sup>*cakrā*, X, 10, 7<sup>d</sup>.

After *yamī anyācca*,— <sup>+</sup>*cakrā*, X, 10, 8<sup>d</sup>.

After *vāyūḥ pūṣā ca*,— <sup>+</sup>*viṣpātī*, VII, 39, 2<sup>b</sup>. (7)

The forms given in the foregoing lists differ in some instances from those of the *Padapāṭha*. Thus in II, 39, we have *śṛṅgeva* in 3<sup>a</sup>, *yugéva* in 4<sup>a</sup>, *nábhyeva* in 4<sup>b</sup> and *nāseva* in 6<sup>c</sup>. The *Padapāṭha* resolves these into *śṛṅga-ivā*, *yugā-iva*, etc. This hymn is mainly an aggregation of thirty similes in which the Aṣvins are described. In twenty-five of these, the dual is unmistakable. Bollensen (*Orient und Occident*, II, 472) suggests that we should read *yugé-va*, *nábhye-va* and *nāse-va* in the places cited, but failed to note *śṛṅgeva*, which should just as obviously be resolved into *śṛṅge-va*. In 7<sup>b</sup> the *Padapāṭha* resolves *kṣāmeva* into *kṣāma-iva*. I have already given in this *Journal* (XXXII, 41 f.) reasons for resolving it into *kṣāmā-iva* and taking *kṣāmā* to be an elliptic dual<sup>1</sup>. Thus we have duals throughout.

In IV, 32, 23<sup>a</sup>, the adjective *vidradhé* shows that the noun in *kanīnakéva* is feminine, hence we must, against the *kanīnakā-iva* of the *Padapāṭha*, accept Bollensen's resolution into *kanīnaké-va*.

In II, 3, 6,—

*sādhv āpāṁsi sanātā na ukṣitē*  
*uṣāsānāktā vayyēva ranvitē |*  
*tāntum tatām samvāyantī samīcī*  
*yajñāsya pécaḥ sudūghe pāyasvatī ||*

<sup>1</sup> So also in X, 106, 10<sup>d</sup>.

The *Padapāṭha* has in *b vayyā-iva*, but *raṇvitē* and the other six duals show that we should, with Grassmann (*WB*, s. v. *iva*), read *vayyē-va*<sup>1</sup>.

The *Padapāṭha* takes the combinations *upadhīva* (II, 39, 4<sup>b</sup>), *cārmanīva* (VI, 8, 3<sup>c</sup>), *dāmpatīva* (II, 39, 2<sup>d</sup>), *nṛpātīva* (VII, 104, 6<sup>d</sup>, X, 106, 4<sup>b</sup>), *pātnīva* (I, 122, 2<sup>a</sup>) *pradhīva* (II, 39, 4<sup>b</sup>) and *viṣpātīva*, (VII, 39, 2<sup>b</sup>), as instances in which the dual desinence *ī* is not *pragrhya*. As the form *va* is now so incontestably established for Vedic, it would seem preferable to take them under the rule as *pragrhya* forms plus *va*. In favor of this disposition of them we have *akṣī iva* (II, 39, 5<sup>b</sup>), *indragnī īṣa* (III, 12, 5<sup>c</sup>; SV. II, 925<sup>c</sup>; 1053<sup>c</sup>; MS. IV, 11, 1<sup>c</sup>; 159, 8), *dyāvāprthivī ihā* (IV, 56, 1<sup>a</sup>; ÇÇ. 8, 19, 1), *brhatī iva* (I, 59, 4<sup>a</sup>), *hārī indra* (VIII, 3, 17<sup>b</sup>; 13, 27<sup>c</sup>; 70, 7<sup>d</sup>; X, 114, 9<sup>d</sup>; SV. I, 301<sup>b</sup>), *hārī iva* (I, 28, 7<sup>c</sup>), *hārī ihā* (I, 16, 2<sup>b</sup>; 121, 8<sup>a</sup>; 177, 4<sup>d</sup>; TB. II, 4, 3, 10<sup>b</sup>), *ārtnī iva* (AV. I, 1, 3<sup>b</sup>), *agnī indra* (TB. II, 4, 5, 7<sup>d</sup>), *indrāgnī idam*, TB. III, 5, 10, 3; MS. IV, 13, 9; 212, 5), *indrāgnī iva* (SMB. 2, 4, 14)<sup>2</sup>. Against it we have, so far as I have found, the unique *rōdasīmē* (*rōdasi-imē*) found in VII, 90, 3<sup>a</sup> and repeated in SV. II, 925<sup>c</sup>; 1053<sup>c</sup>; MS. IV, 11, 1<sup>c</sup>; 159, 8—all the same *pāda*.

In VII, 2, 6, the traditional text reads—

*utā yōṣaṇe divyē mahī na*  
*uśāsānāktā sudūgheva dhenūḥ /*  
*barhiṣādā puruhūtē maghōnī*  
*ā yajñīye suvitāya cṛayetām //*

<sup>1</sup> Many of our handbooks fail to give sufficient recognition to this form *va*. The *Petersburg Wörterbuch* does not cite it for the Vedas. The Monier-Williams *Dictionary* cites it only for the *MBh.* and the *Kāvya* literature "in some more or less doubtful cases". Macdonell's *Dictionary* says *va* for *iva* is "very rare". Speijer and Thumb are silent about it. Bollensen in 1864 (*I. c.*) showed its existence in a number of instances in the *RV.* and Grassmann (*I. c.*) extended Bollensen's list to a total of thirty-seven. Lanman (*NI* pp. 343 and 361) accepts *yugē-va* and *nabhyē-va* in II, 39, 4, *vayyēva* in II, 3, 6, and *kanīnakē-va* in IV, 32, 23 as correct, and *nāse-va* in II, 39, 6 as probable, stating as the other possibility that *nāsā* might be taken as a nom. du. fem. from *nās* "strong". Arnold (*Vedic Metre*, p. 78, § 129) accepts the instances cited from Lanman. Whitney in his *Grammar* has a line and a half (1102f.) about it but in his *Index Verborum to the Atharva Veda* gives ninety-eight instances of "monosyllabic *iva*" in that Veda.

<sup>2</sup> This list is not complete, as the phenomenon did not come under observation until lists were nearly collected.

The *Padapāṭha* gives in *b* *sudúghā-iva*, but Bollensen (*l. c.*) showed the lack of reason in comparing *uśásānāktā* to a single good milch cow, —*sudúghā dhenúḥ*— and proposed the emendation *sudúghe-va dhenūi*. The accumulated duals in *a*, *c* and *d*, and the normal usage in similes seem to make the emendation imperative.

*Padā b* in its traditional form is, however, quite at home in I, 186, 4—

*úpa va éše námasā jigīṣā*  
*uśásānāktā sudúgheva dhenúḥ |*  
*samāné áhan vimímāno arkān*  
*viṣurupe páyasi sásminn údhan //*

[You (= *vīṣve Devās*) I entreat, with reverence, with wish to win, (And) *Uśásānāktā*, like a good milch cow, Arranging (my) song of praise on a common morning With milk of differing hue in this udder].

We believe Ludwig is right in his exegesis,—the singer is the cow lowing with full udder at the milking time, the song he offers is the milk implied in *sudúghā*, the *viṣurupe páyasi* is milk mingled with the yellow Soma juice and the *úghan* is the place of sacrifice whence milky libations flow. Indra is compared to a cow in II, 16, 8<sup>b</sup>; VIII, 1, 10<sup>c</sup>; 14, 3<sup>a</sup>, as is Agni in I, 66, 2<sup>b</sup> and the *kṣetrapati* in IV, 57, 2<sup>b</sup>. So here conversely the Rṣi with his strengthening offering of song. For the transition in *b* from the pl. in *a*, compare that from the sg. of 1<sup>a</sup><sup>b</sup> to the anonymous pl. 1<sup>c</sup>, first named in 2<sup>a</sup>.

In X, 10, 7<sup>d</sup>, the amorous Yamī proposes to Yama—

*vī cid vrheva ráthyeva cakrá,*

and in 8, he replies,—

*anyéna mād āhano yāhi tūyam*  
*téna vī vrha ráthyeva cakrá.*

As *cakrá* may be masc. du. or neut. pl., the question arises which have we here. Grassmann (*WB. s. v.*) considers it plural. Sāyana glosses by *cakre*, hence he took it as dual. The latter is undoubtedly right. The form *cakrá* is demonstrably dual in I, 166, 9<sup>d</sup> and in VIII, 5, 29<sup>c</sup>. The ordinary Vedic chariot was two-wheeled, as will be shown in part III of these studies. The general principle of numerical concord requires the dual. The metaphor in the verb as well as the simile is that of two wheels with a common axle. Hence we conclude that the form is dual in both places.

In the hundred and thirty similes thus far considered, the principle of numerical concord holds. It is not, however, without exceptions, real or apparent. We now pass to a consideration of those similes in which only one term is in the dual. The most frequent case is that in which a dual *upameya* has a singular *upamāna*. Thus in I, 34, 7<sup>cd</sup>,—

*tisró nāsatyā rathyā parāvāta*  
*ātméva vātaḥ svāsarāṇi gachatam.*

[Come, car-borne Nāsatyas o'er the three distances,  
As the breath, the wind, to the early morning sacrifices<sup>1</sup>].

The singular is required for two reasons:—

1. In the RV., *ātman* is *singulare tantum*,
2. The simile is *κατά σύνεσιν*; a duality or plurality of *vātas* would be incongruous in sense, implying discord.

In I, 180, 9<sup>ab</sup> we find, in an Aṣvin simile,

*prā yād vāhethe mahinā rāthasya*  
*prā syandrā yātho mānuṣo nā hōtā*

[When you fare forth by the might of your car,  
You go with haste like (a) man's hotar].

The concord is again *κατά σύνεσιν*. Except on special occasions, the Vedic *yājamānas* has a single *hotar* (see I, 139, 10<sup>a</sup>; III, 41, 2<sup>a</sup>; V, 41, 5<sup>c</sup>; 43, 3<sup>c</sup>; 49, 4<sup>c</sup>; VII, 1, 16<sup>c</sup>; 7, 5<sup>d</sup>; 56, 18<sup>a</sup>; etc.).

One reason for his haste is suggested by I, 25, 17<sup>c</sup>—

*hōteva kṣādase priyām*

[Like a hotar you eat what you are fond of].

A duality of *hotars* is known only in the case of the *dāivyā hōtārā*, variously identified as Agni and Āditya, Agni and Varuṇa, or Āditya and Varuṇa.

The phrase *mānuṣo hōtā* may be taken also as a metonym of Agni (cf. II, 18, 2<sup>b</sup>; III, 3, 2<sup>b</sup>; VII, 8, 2<sup>b</sup>; 73, 2<sup>a</sup>). In this case also, only the singular could be expected.

In X, 106, we have 37 similes with the Aṣvins as *upameya*. The *upamāna* is dual in 35 of them. In 3<sup>c</sup>, however, we find,—

*agnīr iva devayōr dīdivāṁsā*

It would be easy to emend to *agnī iva*, but what would it mean? The Veda knows no two fires of a worshipper. His fire is regularly in the singular. The epithet *triṣadhassthā*, applied to Agni, would warrant the idea of three fires, though *triṣa-*

<sup>1</sup> See JAOS, XXXII, 409 f. or more fully, Geldner, *Ved. Stud.* III, 113 ff.

*dhastā agnī* is found only in the singular. Sāyaṇa explains our passage,— *agnir yathā havirbhiḥ stutibhiḥ ca dīpyate, devān icchato yajamānasya yajñe stutibhir dīptāu bhavathaḥ*. This seems substantially correct, so we would render—

Beaming (du.) like the fire of a worshipper.

An alternative interpretation may be had by taking *agnir* as a proper noun and *devayōr* as an ablative of cause;—

Beaming like Agni (beams) because of his worshipper.

Then in 7<sup>ab</sup>, we have

*pajrēva cárcaram jāram marāyu*  
*kṣādmēvārtheṣu tartarītha ugrā /*

As Griffith says of the passage and its context, “nearly every word is a difficult riddle”. There seems to be in *pāda b* a comparison of the Aṇvins with *kṣadman*, a word found elsewhere in the R.V. only in I, 130, 4<sup>a</sup>, in a comparison with Indra’s thunderbolt. The usual rendering is “Vorlegemesser”. Grassmann (*WB*) says of our passage: “wäre der Dual zu erwarten” and in his *RV.* renders, “wie zwei Vorlegemesser”. The dual, however, is not needed. The following interpretations seem possible. They are arranged in order of preference.

1. The Rev. Dr. J. B. Nies of Brooklyn, N.Y., assures me that the Vedic sacrificial knife, like the Sumerian, was a broad, cleaver-like, two-edged blade. With an ancient specimen found in India, now in his possession, a strong man could sever at a blow the head of a bull. Such a knife with its two edges would answer well the purposes of the simile.

Like two sturdy men, the moving, aging, mortal (world?  
frame?)

You press through to your goals, mighty ones, like a sacrificial knife.

2. The context may be understood as referring to some such exercise of the healing power of the Aṇvins as was manifested in the case of Cyavāna, restored to youth from helpless old age. We should then have a *comparatio compendiaris*,— Your healing, rejuvenating power . . . like the (penetrating power of a) sacrificial knife.

3. On the analogy of *drāghmā* for *drāghmanā* (X, 10, 4<sup>b</sup>) and *raçmā* for *raçmanā* (VI, 67, 1<sup>c</sup>), *kṣādmā* may be an inst. sg.,— “as it were with a sacrificial knife”.

4. *Nāigh.* 2, 11 gives “water” as a meaning of *kṣadman*, as does Sāyaṇa here. Hence the comparison would be between



the *cárcaram jāram marāyu* and *kṣadmā*,— You press through the moving, etc. as through water.

The singular is justified in any of these.

I, 183, 1<sup>d</sup>— *tridhātunā patatho vīr nā parṇāñ*

On your triple car you fly like a bird on its pinions. The Aṣvins are mounted on their triple car,— *trivandhuró*, *trīcakráh* (1<sup>b</sup>), *tráyah pavāyo* (I, 34, 2<sup>a</sup>), *trāyo skambhāsa* (I, 34, 2<sup>c</sup>). The Ṛṣi likens the whole complex, car and riders, to a bird in flight. So we, in the case of an aeroplane carrying two or more persons, would say—"They fly like a bird".

The Veda knows no duality of *parṇám*, even for a single bird. The meaning seems to be "pinions, wing-feathers", rather than "wings". Hence, by metaphor, "the leaves of a tree". Otherwise we might explain the plural here as influenced by the bizarre number of the parts of the chariot.

I, 37, 6— *kó vo vārṣiṣṭha ā naro*  
*divāc ca gmāc ca dhūtayaḥ |*  
*yāt sīm āntam ná dhūnuthā ||*

[Who is your very mightiest, O heroes,  
Ye shakers of heaven and earth,

When ye shake them as the hem (of a garment)?]

The simile is *κατά σύνεσιν*. The Maruts shake heaven and earth as one. Also *ántam* is practically *singulare tantum* in this sense.

VI, 67, 3<sup>cd</sup>; MS. 4, 14, 10<sup>cd</sup>; 231, 6  
*sañ yāv apnasthó apáseva jánāñ*  
*chrudhīyatāc cid yatatho mahitvá*

The *Padapāṭha* has *apāsā-iva*, which may be a nom. dual as in X, 106, 1<sup>b</sup>, or an inst. sg. *Apnastho* may be nom. sg. or acc. pl. Accordingly we may render—

Who by your majesty unite the obedient as by work the lord of an estate (does) his people; or,

As two active (men, overseers) unite (or impel) their laborers.

In the former the stress of comparison lies upon the instrumentals *apāsā* and *mahitvá*. *Mitrāvaruṇā* acting as one would be in comparison *κατά σύνεσιν* with *apnasthó*. In the latter, the comparison is formally correct between MV. and *apāsā* and *apnasthó* must be taken as an adjective, "being at work"<sup>1</sup>, with *jánān*, "people".

<sup>1</sup> This would seem a possible meaning for the word, which is *ἄραξ εἰρημένον* in RV.

VIII, 87, 1<sup>ab</sup>—

*Dyumñí vām stómo aṣvinā*  
*krīvir ná séka á gatam /*

Grassmann, Ludwig and Griffith see here a comparison between *aṣvinā* and *krīvir*. To me the simile is between *stómo* and *krīvir*.

Clear is your song of praise, Aṣvins,  
 As a water-skin in its outpouring. Come ye.  
 Or at least a *comparatio compendiaria* in *pāda b*,  
 Come ye to its outpouring like (to that of) a water-skin.  
 VIII, 73, 17<sup>ab</sup>—

*aṣvinā sú vicākaṣad*  
*vrkṣām paraṣumāñ iva /*  
 18<sup>ab</sup> *púram ná dhr̥ṣṇāv á ruja*  
*kṛṣṇáyā bādhitó viṣā /*

These are separated only by an irrelevant refrain common to every *rc* of the hymn. It seems better to take them together. The translations of Grassmann, Ludwig and Griffith take the comparison in 17 to be between *aṣvinā* and *vrkṣām*, but Ludwig in his commentary would place the punctuation at the close of *pāda a*. This seems much better. The passage is not clear, but if we accept with Sāyaṇa a reference to the story of Saptavadhri, who, in V, 78, 5, 6, seems to have had hand or foot caught in a split tree and to have been extricated when he invoked the Aṣvins' aid, we may render somehow thus—

When you see clearly the Aṣvins,  
 Like a man with an axe, strong one, break down the tree,  
 Like the fort (that you once broke down)  
 When (you were) harassed by the black folk.

Saptavadhri is named in 9<sup>a</sup> preceding. The incident in 18 may have given him the name (prosynonym), "the one having seven eunuchs", as black aborigines may have been taken captives here and made his eunuchs. Grassmann (*WB*) refers 18 to Indra, though there is no allusion to him elsewhere in the hymn.

IV, 41, 8<sup>ab</sup>—

*tā vām dhīyó 'vase vājayāntīr*  
*ājīm ná jagmur yuvayūh sudānū /*

I do not see the comparison of some of the translators between *vām* and *ājīm*. At the most it would be a *comparatio compendiaria* as *vām* could be compared only to the goal not

to the race track. The meaning seems to be—These hymns, O bounteous givers, longing for both of you, racing for (the prize of) your favor, have gone to the track as it were, (*i. e.*, in competition with those of other Ṛṣis).

Conversely the singular may have a dual *upamāna*.

Thus in III, 18, 1<sup>ab</sup>, we have

*Bhāvā no agne sumānā ūpetāu  
sākheva sākhye pitāreva sādhuḥ /*

[Be thou gracious, Agni, on our approach,

Good as friend to friend, as one's father and mother].

The meaning of *pitāra* as an elliptic dual excludes the singular. There is no need of Bollensen's labored attempt (*op. cit.* p. 472) to explain *pitāreva* as *pitāre-va*, and this *pitāre* as an archaic dative and the elliptic rendering "as (a son) to his father".

X, 89, 2<sup>ab</sup>—

*sū sūryaḥ pāry urā vārāṁsy  
ēndro vāvṛtyād rāthyeva cakrā /*

[He (Indra) is Sūrya. Through the wide expanses,

Indra turns hitherward like the wheels of a chariot].

A commentary may be based on

I, 30, 14<sup>c</sup>— *ṛnór ākṣam nā cakryòḥ* and

I, 166, 9<sup>d</sup>— *ākṣo vaç cakrā samāyā vī vāvṛte*.

Both in our passage, X, 89, 2<sup>b</sup>, and in I, 166, 9<sup>d</sup>, Grassmann takes *cakrā* as neut. pl., apparently not considering what manner of chariot it would be with a plurality of wheels upon a single axle. Ludwig in his commentary remarks that *cakrā* may be inst. sg. It would be a bizarre picture, indeed, to represent the mighty Indra rolling through the vast expanses by a single chariot wheel. *Cakrā* is masc. dual in both passages, as this alone is the normal number. The two wheels on one axle turn together.

X, 59, 1<sup>abc</sup>—

*Prā tāry āyuḥ pratarāṁ nāvīya  
sthātāreva krātumatā rāthasya /  
ādha cyāvāna ut tavīty ārtham*

Grassmann, Ludwig and Griffith, all see a comparison between *āyuḥ* (sg.) and *sthātārā* (du.). If this were the case, the dual could be easily defended by the analogy of II, 12, 8<sup>c</sup>—

*samānām cid rātham ātasthivānsā*

The twain mounted on a common car, *i. e.* the king, or

warrior, and the driver, hence the two usual occupants of the car, the familiar later *rathināu*.

A study of the hymn, however, suggests another interpretation as more in keeping with its general tenor. Four times, in *rcas* 4, 5, 6 and 7, the *R̥ṣi* asks for longer life. Four times he asks for sight,—

4<sup>b</sup>— *páçyema nú sūryam uccárantam.*

5<sup>c</sup>— *rārandhī nah sūryasya samidhī.*

6<sup>a</sup>— *pūnar asmāsu cáksuḥ (dhehi).*

6<sup>c</sup>— *jyók paçyema sūryam uccárantam.*

Thus the burden of his song is life and light. We may find both desires in the opening lines, and render—

May (Subandhu's) life be carried forward anew,

May the guides as it were of his car be possessed of power,

Then active, he will effect his purpose.

Grassmann both in his *WB.* and his *RV.* takes *krátumatā* as a nom. du. built on the weak stem instead of on the strong. Lanman (*NI.* 516) considers this "not improbable". *Sthātārā* is thus in comparison with an implied *akṣyāu* (eyes) and the dual is normal both for this reason and for that already suggested. This interpretation does not greatly differ from Lanman's (*l. c.*): "Discerning are the two guides as it were of the body". As he does not state how he arrives at this, one cannot tell how much we differ in method of approach.

The dual might have a plural *upamāna*, but this does not seem to occur in the *RV.* Two passages have, however, been so taken.

I, 141, 11<sup>c d</sup>—

*raçmīr iva yó yāmati jánmanī ubhé*

*devānām çānsam rtá á ca sukrátuḥ*

[Which with kindly power guides as they were reins  
both races and the praise of the gods at sacrifice].

Here the formal *upameya* is *jánmanī ubhé devānām çānsam ca*, a dual plus a singular, so the plural *raçmīr* is formally normal. There is, however, a sort of *comparatio compendiaria* here. The races are guided but the reins are only the instrument by which the horse, or horses, are guided. So "reins" is equivalent to "steeds directed by the reins". The steeds of the figure would be the individual members of the two races. Again the *RV.* knows no duality of *raçmī*, but uses the pl. even in the case of a single horse, as in I, 144, 3<sup>d</sup>— *vólhur*

*ná raçmîn*, or a collective sg., even for plural horses, as in V, 44, 3<sup>d</sup>, *hárinām*. So the pl. is amply justified, even if *jánmanī* alone be taken as *upameya* of the simile.

I, 95, 6— *ubhé bhadré joṣayete ná méne*  
*gávo ná vāgrā úpa tasthur évāih /*  
*sá dākṣānām dākṣapatir babhūva*  
*añjānti yām dakṣinató havírbhiḥ //*

[Both auspicious ones, like dames, fondle (Agni).

Like lowing kine they stand about in their wise.

He of the wise became lord of wisdom,

Whom, on the right, they balm with their oblations].

The translators give no intimation of taking the simile in *pādas a* and *b* otherwise than between *ubhé bhadré* (= *uśāsā-nāktā* or *dyāvāprthivī*) and the pl. *gávo*. But clearly *b*, like *d*, refers to the worshippers, who in *b*, in wonted wise, stand about the newly born Agni and in *d* pour their oblations of oil upon him. The hymn is marked by some of those swift and sudden transitions in which the R̥sis frequently delight. Thus in 1 we have day and night, in 2 Tvaṣṭar's ten daughters, in 3 the *yajamānās*, in 4 and 5<sup>a</sup><sup>b</sup> Agni, in 5<sup>c</sup><sup>d</sup>, 6<sup>a</sup> *uśāsānāktā* or *dyāvāprthivī*, 6<sup>b</sup> the *yajamānās* 6<sup>c</sup> Agni, 6<sup>d</sup> the *yajamānās*, 7-11 Agni. There is thus no comparison between *ubhé bhadré* and *gávo* and the plural of *b* is normal.

Conversely a plural may have a dual *upamāna*.

I, 59, 4<sup>a</sup>— *brhatī iva sūnāve ródasī gíro*  
 [Like the great twain worlds are the praises (offered)  
 to their son, i. e., Agni is everywhere praised,  
 his songs fill the vast heaven and earth].

*Ródasī* is here a *duale tantum*, it could not be pluralized. Nor could *gíro* be made dual, for imagine the bathos of two songs filling the vast reaches of the two worlds. The plural indicates the vast volume of multitudinous songs.

VII, 2, 5— *svādhyò ví dúro devayántaḥ*  
*ácīçrayū rathayúr devátātā /*  
*pūrvī çīçum ná mātārā rihāné*  
*sám agrúvo ná sámanesv añjan //*

[The pious worshippers opened wide the doors

fain for chariots in the god's service;

Like rich parents caress their child,

Like maidens (adorn themselves) for the assembly,

they adorn him].

The numerical concord of *pādas a, b* and *d* is broken by the dual of *c*. Sāyaṇa explains the metaphor of *mātārā* by the sacrificial ladles, *juhū* and *upabhṛt*; Ludwig suggests also *dyāvāprthivī*. In either case the elliptic dual must remain as a *duale tantum* in its meaning.

Here may belong also:—

I, 180, 4<sup>d</sup>—

*rāthyeva cakrā prāti yanti mādhvah*

[Like chariot wheels run the sweet (juices)].

IV, 30, 2<sup>ab</sup>— *satrā te ānu kṛṣṭāyo*

*vīgvā cakrēva vāvrtuḥ*

[All people have run together

as chariot wheels after you (Indra)].

X, 117, 5<sup>cd</sup>—

*ó hí vārtante rāthyeva cakrā*

*anyām-anyam ūpa tiṣṭhanta rāyaḥ*

[Verily riches roll on like chariot wheels

Now one, now another, they approach].

There is doubt whether *cakrā* is here dual, the conventional number for a chariot, or plural for a plurality of chariots.

In the examination of these twenty passages we see that a real lack of numerical concord may be due (1) to words that are found only in one grammatical number in the meaning required; (2) to constructions in which there is concord of sense rather than of form; (3) to poetic exigency as strict concord would lead to incongruity, bathos, etc.; (4) to rhetorical tropes, etc. There is always a good and sufficient reason for the lack of numerical concord. The instances in which the examination has led to new interpretations show something of the value of the principle in Vedic hermeneutics.

A collection of the similes with lack of concord between the singular and plural numbers, which the writer is making, will illustrate and corroborate the foregoing and will furnish new interpretations for several Vedic passages.

#### AV.

The Atharva Veda has few duals in similes. Those which show the normal numerical concord between the substantive terms are—

After *ajirādhirājāu* (= *mṛtyúḥ ca nīrṛtiḥ ca*) — *cyenāu* (VII, 70, 3<sup>b</sup>).

After *ántāu* — *sammātārāu* (XIII, 2, 13<sup>b</sup>). See *JAOS.* XXXII, 44.

After *gádhrāu* — \**kurkurāu* (VII, 95, 2<sup>c</sup>); *gávāu* (VII, 95, 2<sup>b</sup>);  
and *vṛkāu* (VII, 95, 2<sup>d</sup>).

After *muškā* (*strīyās*) — *gardabhāu* (XX, 136, 2<sup>d</sup>); *ṣakulāu* (XX, 136, 1<sup>d</sup>).

With elliptic dual as antecedent—

After *dāmpatī* — \**cakravākā* (XIV, 2, 64<sup>b</sup>).

With dual dvandva as antecedent—

After *dyāvāprthivī* — *dhenū* (IV, 22, 4<sup>b</sup>).

After *prāṇāpānāu* — *anadvāhāu* (III, 10, 5<sup>b</sup>; VII, 53, 5<sup>b</sup>).

With two singulars as antecedent—

After (*ṣrutādhāraṇā ca médhā ca*) — \**ártmī* (I, 1, 3<sup>b</sup>).

After *āvām* = *strī anyā ca* (or *anyāc ca*) — *sākhāyāu* (VI, 42, 1<sup>d</sup>, 2<sup>a</sup>).

To these are to be added a few listed also in RV.—

After *indrāsómā* (RV. VII, 104, 6<sup>b</sup>) — *ácṣvā* (VIII, 4, 6<sup>b</sup>).

After *indrāsómā* (RV. VII, 104, 6<sup>d</sup>) — *nrpātī* (VIII, 4, 6<sup>d</sup>).

After (*havirdhāne*) (RV. X, 13, 2<sup>a</sup>) — *yamé* (XVIII, 3, 38<sup>b</sup>).

After *yamāc ca yamī ca* (RV. X, 10, 7<sup>d</sup>) — *cakrā* (XVIII, 1, 8<sup>d</sup>).

After *yamī ca anyāc ca* (RV. X, 10, 8<sup>d</sup>) — *cakrā* (XVIII, 1, 9<sup>d</sup>).

Of similes with but one dual member, I find a single instance, — III, 29, 6 —

*ireva nōpa dasyati*  
*samudrā iva páyo mahát /*  
*devāu savāsínāv iva*  
*ṣitipān nopa dasyati //*

[Like a refreshing draught he faileth not,  
Like the sea, the great water,  
Like the twain gods that dwell together,  
The white-footed (ram) faileth not].

The concord in the singular in *pādas a, b* and *d* is broken by the dual in *c*, in which the reference is to the *aṣvinā*, *duale tantum*.

The Rig Veda gives us 130 similes with the dual in both the *upameya* and the *upamāna* and at least 13, at most 20, others in which but one term is in the dual. The Atharva Veda gives but 19 similes with complete dual concord, and but one in which a single dual is found.

\* Starred forms are ἀπαξ εἰρημένα in AV. All the words listed have *iva* as the particle of comparison.

Not only in the dual but also in the other numbers does the AV. show a remarkable lack of similes as compared with the RV. Thus, according to the citations in Whitney's *Index Verborum*, we have in the entire twenty books of the AV. only 368 similes with *iva* or *va* and 38 with *ná*, a total of 401, against the 207 similes with *iva* and 315 with *ná*, a total of 522, found by actual count in the first book alone of the RV. Of these the AV. has 40 with *iva* and 14 with *ná*, that are common to it and to the RV.

These figures give a conclusive demonstration of the enormous difference between these two Vedas in the use of figurative language, in their poetic power and artistic technique, and afford a strong confirmation of the statements made by the writer in this *Journal*, XXX, 182ff. and XXXII, 33ff. The study of the instances in which the general numerical concord between the terms of a simile is not maintained affords another demonstration of the vast gulf that so often separates the artistic, hieratic Ṛṣi of the Rig and the feebly imitative and essentially prosaic Shaman of the Atharva in the skill with which they use rhetorical tropes and syntactical schemata.

This study amply illustrates also the strict use of the dual in Vedic.